



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: LAI, Ming-Hsiao

SERIAL NO.: 10/791,380

ART UNIT: 3751

FILED: March 3, 2004

EXAMINER: Phillips, C.E.

TITLE: REINFORCED DESIGN OF BATHROOM WALL MOUNTED RACK CONNECTOR
AMENDMENT "A"

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of December 20, 2005, a response be due by March 20, 2006, and in response to an Office communication of March 31, 2006, having a response due by April 30, 2006, please enter the present amendments and consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully re-submits the present Amendment "A" in a revised format in response to the Office communication March 31, 2006. The Examiner recognized a copying error in the amendment sent to the Examiner on March 6, 2006 and has allowed Applicant to correct the submission with the present Amendment A. Applicant respectfully contends that the present amendment is now in compliance with the required amendment practice. The present amendment has been sent before expiration of the shortened statutory period for response such that a fee for extension of time is not currently due.

Upon entry of the present amendments, previous Claims 1 - 3 have been canceled and new Claims 4 and 5 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Tisdall patent. Claims 1 - 3 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has indicated that "Claims 2 - 3 with the 112 issues resolved

would appear to define patentable subject matter."

In reply to the Official Action, Applicant has extensively amended the original claim language in the form of new Claims 4 and 5. New Claims 4 and 5 express the original limitations in a more proper U.S. format, including proper antecedent bases and proper structural interrelationships throughout. Any indefinite terminology found in the original claim language has been corrected herein.

So as to place the claims into a proper condition for allowance, new independent Claim 4 incorporates the limitations of original independent Claim 1, along with the limitations of objected-to Claim 2. As such, independent Claim 4 should be in a proper condition for allowance.


New independent Claim 5 incorporates the limitations of original independent Claim 1, along with the limitations of objected-to Claim 3. As such, new independent Claim 5 should be in a proper condition for allowance.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claims 4 and 5 are now in proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

4-11-06
Date

Customer No. 24106



John S. Egbert
Reg. No. 30,627
Andrew W. Chu
Reg. No. 46,625
Attorney for Applicant
Egbert Law Offices
412 Main Street, 7th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(713)224-8080
(713)223-4873 fax